MANDATE

S.D.N.Y.-N.Y.C. 10-cv-325 10-cv-448 10-cv-449 Batts, J.

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, in the City of New York, on the 6th day of April, two thousand eleven,

D۴	esent	•
11	CSCIII	

Ralph K. Winter, John M. Walker, Jr., José A. Cabranes, Circuit Judges.

USDC SDNY			
DOCUMENT			
ELECTRONICALLY FILED			
DOC #:			
DATE FILED:	May 24, 2011		

In re Bruce D. Sturman, Howard P. Sturman, Wayne A. Sturman,

Debtors.

Donna Sturman,

Appellant,

v. 10-4206-bk 10-4209-bk 10-4217-bk

Appellee.

As a preliminary matter, the appeal docketed under 10-4209-bk was dismissed on the grounds that Appellant had failed to file Forms C and D. *See* U.S.C.A. Dkt. No. 10-4209-bk at docs. 11 and 14. However, we construe Appellant's Forms C and D filed under 10-4217-bk as applying to 10-4209-bk. *See* U.S.C.A. Dkt. No. 10-4217-bk at docs. 14 and 19. Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the appeal docketed under 10-4209-bk is REINSTATED and the three above-captioned appeals are consolidated for purposes of this order.

Appellee, through counsel, moves to dismiss the above-captioned appeals on the grounds that Appellant lacked standing to appeal from an order of the bankruptcy court to the district court. In deciding whether the district court properly dismissed a bankruptcy appeal, we review issues of standing de novo. See In re Zarnel, 619 F.3d 156, 161 (2d Cir. 2010); see also In re O'Brien, 184 F.3d 140 (2d Cir. 1999) (per curian) (affirming district court's dismissal for lack of standing). Accordingly, upon due consideration, it is further ORDERED that Appellee's motion is construed as a motion for summary affirmance, and, as construed, is GRANTED because the appeals lack an arguable basis in law or fact. See United States v. Monsalve, 388 F.3d 71, 73 (2d Cir. 2004) (per curiam); Pillay v. INS, 45 F.3d 14, 16-17 (2d Cir. 1995) (per curiam). Appellant lacked standing to appeal from the underlying bankruptcy court order given that she has no pecuniary interest in the Sturman estates in light of the December 2002 court-approved settlement agreement. See In re Zarnel, 619 F.3d at 161; In re Gucci, 126 F.3d 380, 388 (2d Cir. 1997). Insofar as Appellant challenges the settlement's enforceability, she is barred from doing so under the doctrine of res judicata. See Greenberg v. Bd. of Governors of Fed. Reserve Sys., 968 F.2d 164, 168 (2d Cir. 1992); see also In re Gibraltar Resources, Inc., 210 F.3d 573, 576-77 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Medomak Canning, 922 F.2d 895, 900-01 (1st Cir. 1990).

> FOR THE COURT: Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

Catherine

A True Copy

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe Clerk

United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit

2